DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 011 RE 003 929

TITLE	Intensive Reading Instructional Teams, Hartford, Connecticut. An Evaluative Report.
INSTITUTION	Hartford Public Schools, Conn.
PUB DATE	Nov 71
NOTE	40p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Individualized Reading; Instructional Technology; Language Development; *Program Evaluation; Reading Centers; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Diagnosis; *Reading Programs; *Small Group Instruction; *Team Teaching; Vocabulary Development; Word Study Skills

ABSTRACT

For 6 years, three intensive reading instructional teams (IRIT's) provided intensive small-group reading instruction to school children within Hartford's validated target areas. A total of 363 children were assisted by the overall program. The centers also provided facilities for the diagnosis of reading problems, for team teaching, language enrichment, and for the use of eclectic approaches to reading instruction. The program was departmentalized with team members specializing in one of the three instructional areas: language development and individualized reading, decoding and word attack skills, and vocabulary and comprehension development. A number of techniques were employed for the overall assessment of the program. Various group test data which documented pupil progress for the implementation of prescriptive instruction were used, and several test analyses were developed. Improvement gains were significant at the .01 level. The test data were substantiated by an analysis of parent and teacher evaluation forms. A vast majority of comments reported were highly favorable toward the overall conduct of the program. Appendixes are included. (AW)

ED 061011

IRIT
1971

PPPPP

PRELUDE TO PROGRESS

An Evaluative Report

HARTFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS·249 HIGH STREET·HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103

RE 003 929

INTENSIVE READING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

- 1970-1971 -

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation Office
Hartford Public Schools
November 1971

PREFACE

The narrative portions of this report were prepared from materials submitted by M. Beatrice Wood, Assistant Supervisor of Reading and IRIT Coordinator.

Robert J. Nearine

October 27, 1971
lw

INTENSIVE READING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAMS

- 1970-1971 -

Overview

For the sixth successive year, three Intensive Reading Instructional Teams, or I.R.I.T.'s as they are commonly called, once again provided intensive small-group reading instruction to youngsters attending schools within Hartford's validated target areas. With two of the centers providing reading instruction for second and third graders, and the third team - for the first time-providing services to "in house" pupils and teachers at the newly-opened Waverly School, a total of 363 children were assisted by the overall program.

The program for all centers continued to utilize the team approach which had previously proven to be so successful, with teachers working with pupils in language arts and reading instruction. In the morning, the IRIT program was devoted to reading and language arts instruction; in the afternoon, students returned to their home school where they received instruction in other non-language areas.

In addition to working directly with children, the Centers also provided facilities for the diagnosis of reading problems, for team teaching, language enrichment, and for the use of eclectic approaches to reading instruction. In the I.R.I.T.'s, there was no "one way" for teaching reading; consequently, many different methods and techniques were used and these were selected to meet the needs of each and every individual child.

Project Description

While all three Intensive Instructional Teams followed a similar mode of operation, the "in-house" Waverly team differed slightly from the overall pattern.

Here, the team serviced only one school and worked with pupils from ungraded multi-instructional areas. Because of this situation grade level placement was not involved as a factor to be considered in the selection of students for the program.

Each reading team was made up of a reading consultant who served as the team leader, two teachers with strong backgrounds in reading, and a clerk typist. Teams worked in eight to ten week cycles throughout the school year, with each cycle servicing from 36 to 45 pupils. The program was departmentalized with team members specializing in one of three instructional areas: language development and individualized reading, decoding and word attack skills, and vocabulary and comprehension development. These areas can be described as follows:

1. Language Development and Individualized Reading

The main purpose of this area was to develop an appreciation and enjoyment of literature. To do this, a wide variety of books, tapes, records and activities were made available to each pupil who, again depending upon his level of reading development, received an individualized program of instruction. Each day, selected pupils met individually or in small groups with their teacher to work on specific skills areas. Here, individual conferences were used for diagnostic purposes and to help the youngsters to build up their self-confidence and with it their joy of reading. Special books were shared and choral reading was an important outgrowth of this area. Sometimes pupils teamed to complete assigned tasks; yet at other times self direction was emphasized; and in almost all cases the teacher acted as an advisor and a counselor in the overall directing of program.

2. Decoding Area

Here, word analysis skills were emphasized and many different clues to the decoding of words were taught. An individualized approach to instruction using linguistically programmed materials was one employed vehicle. These materials were used because a basic knowledge of phoneme grapheme relationship is essential to adequate word analysis. Once again, individual diagnosis was used to provide the prescriptions for each child's reading program and this was further emphasized by conferences with teachers in the other areas so that all could provide the necessary coordination and correlation which was needed to insure the proper decoding skills' development.

3. Vocabulary and Comprehension Development Area

In this area, a particularly strong program correlation with that of the sending school was emphasized. To do this a vocabulary check was given to each pupil with the results being used to provide reinforcement and to guide the selection of enrichment activities so as to further the growth of vocabulary. Through individualized instruction the refinement of perceptual skills was stressed and with them the development of the skills of main idea sequence, and the finding of supporting details.

The Waverly in-house I.R.I.T. performed some services for the general school staff at the request of the school administration:

a. At Waverly, team members were used as resource people during the development of a scope and sequence project in language arts.

b. The team held an in-service meeting for Waverly teachers on the methods and materials which were being used by the I.R.I.T. A

booklet, "Happiness Is", developed by the I.R.I.T., formed the basis for an in-service meeting oriented around the subject of school discipline.

c. Three students from one MIA who did not meet the criteria for selection, were tutored three days a week for approximately four months by team members.

Successful Outcomes

1. The coordinator reported that particular success was noted when the materials employed in the vocabulary and comprehension area accurately coincided with those which were used for decoding training. For example, B.R.L. and McGraw-Hill programmed materials, Stern's Structural Reading Program, and the Muriel Dwyer Reading Scheme blended with both the S.R.A. basal reading materials and with the Lippincott Reading program far better than did the programs which stressed a sight-word method of reading.
2. The I.R.I.T. - produced children's weekly newspaper continued to be a source of pride and of pleasure both in school and at home.
3. Teacher-made manipulative materials increased the knowledge and understanding of words and the reinforcement of phonetic skills.
4. The Muriel Dwyer Reading Program proved to be extremely valuable when used as a reinforcing or supplementary technique to the total reading program.
5. A new project this year was a Weekly Summary Report. Prepared by each center, summary reported of I.R.I.T. instructional activities were sent to each participating teacher to better coordinate team activities and the school program. Instructional ideas and sample

lessons were also included with the reports. In addition, some centers also made weekly visits to the schools and these were described by teachers as being very beneficial.

6. The I.R.I.T. Open House continued to be one of the most successful activities with an average of at least 40% of the parents visiting the sponsoring centers.

7. The electric typewriter was especially useful in developing and maintaining a high student interest in spelling and reading activities. This continued to be one of the more popular activities for youngsters.

8. The increased number of multi-ethnic and multi-racial books available for individualized instruction gave some evidence that the improvement of attitude and of self-image had been evidenced by the book's general popularity.

9. The use of an individualized schedule in one Center was particularly helpful in promoting self-direction and self-motivation on the part of the pupils.

10. The "in-house" center found that an easy availability of special school services made it possible to work with some children whose personal problems might otherwise have prevented successful I.R.I.T. participation.

11. Many booklets were developed by the teams; these included:

Emanuel Reading Center:

"A is for Alphabet"

Children's Reading Center:

"An overhead transparency version of the book,

"Caps for Sale."

"A short vowel booklet illustrated by each child"

"From Airplane to Zipper".

Waverly Reading Center:

"Happiness Is"

"Books, Books, Books"

"I Want To Be A - - -"

12. A library was established whereby children could take books home on a daily basis. This procedure developed a sense of responsibility and encouraged an added enjoyment of reading as well as an independent opportunity to practice reading skills.
13. Pupils in the Waverly Center read an average of 12 books per pupil during the ten week cycle while pupils from the Children's Reading Center read an average of six books. In all three centers, an increased interest in reading was in evidence.

Problem Areas

1. The problem of Center housing continued to be one of the program's greatest difficulties.
2. Communication with some teachers was difficult. It would have been an asset to the teams if the schools had kept the centers advised of activities in a similar manner to the way in which the centers communicated to the schools.
3. Attendance for one group of pupils during one cycle was poor. This cycle ran concurrently with the teachers' strike.
4. Provision of an aide to ride the bus with some youngsters would be helpful.

5. Tutoring pupils in the afternoon for the "in-house team" proved to be very time consuming and made joint planning more difficult.

Evaluation Program

In terms of the evaluative methodology, a number of techniques were employed for the overall assessment of the program. One of these techniques was the use of various group test data which documented pupil progress as a basis for the implementation of prescriptive instruction. Among the instruments used were the following:

1. McKee Inventory of Phonic Skills.
2. Botel Phonics Inventory.
3. Metropolitan Achievements Test in Reading - Primary Battery I, Forms A and B.
4. California Reading Achievement Test, Forms W and X - Lower Primary and Upper Primary.
5. Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty and the Mills Learning Methods Test were used for the three tutorial pupils.
6. Durrell Letter Name Test.

To determine what overall gains were elicited by the IRIT program, a number of test analyses were developed. These analyses, and their results, have been reported on a center by center, and a boy versus girl basis.

1. When the Garden and Emanuel Centers were compared as centers and by sex an analysis of the three MAT reading sub scores showed no significant mean differences. For the Waverly Center, similar analyses of the California Reading Test subscores showed no significant mean differences when the youngsters were compared on

the basis of sex.

2. At the Emanuel Center, the analysis of 102 second grade MAT scores showed that significant gains were made in the areas of Word Knowledge, Word Discrimination and Total Reading. Similarly, an analysis of the same three MAT reading subscores at Garden Street for the 103 students who were tested also showed a highly significant gain pattern. For both centers and in all three subscore areas, gains were significant at the .01 level. That is to say, the probability that these gains were due merely to chance was only one in one hundred!
3. An analysis of the Waverly School California Vocabulary Comprehension, and Reading subscores for 129 tested students also produced mean gains which exceeded the .01 level of confidence.
4. When the gains were further analyzed by sex within each center, the boys and the girls achieved at about the same level. The one exception was the Waverly girls who achieved significantly better than the boys, but on only the Vocabulary subscore and at a slightly, but not significantly lower level on the other two subscores.

The highly salutary nature of the resultant data was further substantiated by an analysis of parent and teacher Program Evaluation forms. Here, comments extracted at random from each group of forms have been reported by the Waverly School reading consultant as follows:

1. As reading consultant, what changes in the reading achievement of the attending pupils do you attribute to the I.R.I.T. Program?

a. A more positive attitude towards "reading" and a greater desire to read for pleasure.

b. Children who otherwise may have been overlooked seemed to display more self-confidence in themselves in the area of reading - several extremely quiet children, seemed to have enjoyed the small group activities and learned how to speak before a group.

c. Children also seemed to discover how important reading really is - and displayed a strong desire towards self-improvement.

2. What effect did the I.R.I.T. have on your reading program?

a. The I.R.I.T. program at Waverly enabled the MIA teachers to change their existing reading programs to models similar to that of the I.R.I.T. Variations in the MIA's were made since emphasis was placed on areas based on the needs of the group and/or individuals. For example, one group of children was placed in a basal program; another MIA stressed grammatical skills, spelling and writing. All in all, the I.R.I.T. program did have a positive influence on the MIA Language Arts program.

3. What suggestions do you have that would help us improve the I.R.I.T. Program?

a. Group meetings with MIA team members and parents in the late afternoon or evening to discuss individual children, develop materials and write-up specific suggestions on the individual to be used by teachers and parents.

b. More emphasis on teacher recommendations than on cumulative folder findings when selecting children.

Teacher evaluation forms reflecting services which were provided to some 225 youngsters at the Garden and Emanuel Centers were comparable to those collected at Waverly.

1. What changes have you noticed in the skills of the children attending the I.R.I.T.? Describe briefly.

Some of my children have a more positive attitude toward school. It gave them the extra help they needed. We have been moving at a faster pace than before.

None that I found which were due to the time spent at learning center.

Four of my five are able to recognize more letters and hear sounds much better.

Word attack much better. Sight words, phonics improved.

For the most part, the reading doesn't have that word-to-word caliber.

Have not yet had much opportunity for this evaluation since part of day remaining when they return is spent on arithmetic and other subjects which give not too much idea.

Vocabulary has increased. Oral reading has improved. Decoding skills have been reinforced, and are being put to use. Comprehension has also improved.

2. What changes in the children's attitude toward reading did you notice? Describe briefly.

They always were eager to learn but were discouraged easily. They were afraid to try. They seem to have gained some confidence in attacking reading.

They did't like reading during time spent at reading clinic.

The children's attitudes toward books seems improved. They select a book, rather than other available activities during a free period assignment.

The children seem to enjoy reading more. An increased interest in oral reading has also been noticed.

Want to pick up a book to read for pleasure.

More interest is given to reading materials within the classroom. They all seem more eager to learn new skills. All have definitely gained more self-confidence. Reading has become a "happy" experience.

One girl in particular seems more interested in doing outside reading.

All of the children attending seem to enjoy reading and want to read more.

Generally, the students seemed more interested in reading books that were in the classroom.

Those attitudes which changed were positive in nature.

3. What changes have you noticed in your pupils' attention span? Describe.

No significant changes. Mine is a low, slow group, far below their grade level. It would take a much longer period of time to develop an increased attention span.

They are able to concentrate on prescribed skills for a short time.

Very little - children with a short attention span, inattentiveness, overactive, still display same tendencies generally. The children who display more control, eagerness still have same qualities.

They can sit through a reading group lesson without becoming tired but this is still a problem area for some children.

Has greatly improved in all but a few cases.

Because they have developed more interest in reading activities, they are able to work for a longer period of time within the classroom. Their ability to concentrate has also shown improvement.

Seem to be able to work a little longer on their own.

In two out of three children, I have noticed an increase in the attention span.

They seemed to have improved for the most part.

4. What behavioral changes have you noticed? Please specify.

They seemed to have settled down. They are now willing to work at a problem. They have learned more words which helps with their seatwork.

These children have, of course, made many behavioral changes but I can't say any are due to time spent at reading clinic.

I cannot honestly say I have noticed any obvious behavioral changes.

Negligible. Not a problem area.

Able to adapt more easily to changes to environment. Accept more readily others who can help them.

Having gained more self-confidence, most are more eager to learn and will take the initiative to use materials provided in classroom. They take pride in completing assigned tasks also.

Children were very proud of work they brought back. Seemed to build their morale.

None.

5. Were you able to visit the I.R.I.T. program to see it in action?

Yes 19

No 3

6. How many pupils remained with you during the A.M.?The average of 11+.

7. What affect did the I.R.I.T. program have on the children who remained in your classroom?

Easier for me to help children individually.

I don't think the children were bothered by the fact that they were left behind. They enjoyed hearing the other children's experiences and vice versa.

Most of them thrived on the attention.

Gave teacher more time for individual help..

There were less children to work with; therefore, they were given more enrichment activities and more individual attention. They seemed to progress at a bit faster pace.

All wanted to attend the IRIT program. Eager to look at seatwork, workbooks, etc. I had more time to do intensive work with remaining pupils.

None.

Was able to give more individualized attention to the rest of the class. The Multi-Instructional Area program performed much better.

Initial reaction envious - later benefited as we have adapted the IRIT concept as our program. We were forced into rigid scheduling but managed through cooperation from specials and other Multi-Instructional Area.

8. How would you improve the I.R.I.T. Program? Describe briefly.

I would have continued it for a full day. These children were not ready to work in the afternoon.

I think that a long time is needed for these kids to work on various skills.

Extend it to more children.

Have more time to observe the IRIT program in action.

Meetings every week to keep abreast of children's progress and/or difficulties.

IRIT program is terrific. It restores my faith in Hartford's programs. Maybe you could expand?

Everything looked real good to me and well planned.

It is fine as it is but I do wish a similar set-up could be provided for the children with behavioral problems.

Include more children for longer periods of time.

The only improvement would be to expand it.

I would like to see the IRIT expanded so that more of my children and others in our school, would have the opportunity to attend and benefit from the intensive training.

Have an I.R.I.T. program at each school.

Would like to have more children participate.

Extend IRIT to be available to many more children who could benefit.

The classroom teachers should have more of a say in who gets into the program.

Allow the students to visit the library once in a while. Though the IRIT book selection is excellent, many of the

kids have asked why they haven't gone to the library.

At Waverly - possible to get more serious students into program. Felt that fewer children really needed the intensive program. I'm sure that a group of 45 youngsters from two or more MIA's with most serious reading problems for 15-20 weeks might have been more beneficial.

From what I've observed so far, the program could become more effective if it was extended for a longer period of time. Some of the other teachers, as well as myself, felt that many of the children <u>not</u> in the program could have benefited <u>more</u> than some of those who were in the program. For example, one student in IRIT was in Book 19 when he was chosen by IRIT. At the time when so many fell below their level, one of these children could have been helped more by the program. I don't feel the program was as effective as it should have been.

9. How have the pupil progress reports helped you?

I would have liked individual reports as the program continued. However, the papers sent were helpful in that it gave me some idea where they were as a whole.

They confirmed my own personal evaluation of pupils' needs and also coincided with results of the Cooper tests I gave them in September 1970.

Yes, it gave me some ideas to use with the children.

I knew what was worked on in the IRIT program. Also, I found out games, etc. that might help the kids.

To know better individual problems and differences.

Have not yet seen final reports, however, intermediary reports were good - appeared accurate - corresponded to my own observations and gave better insights.

Mrs._____Is visits and individual reports helped in my daily planning. I found the follow-thru lesson plans a big help. I tried to correlate what you did with my language program so that the children in either group would not feel excluded.

They kept one informed,enabled me to keep up with their progress, and plan around their program.

They have helped to supply ideas for some of the other slow ones.

In planning for those who went to IRIT.

Most definitely! I've used some ideas with my children.

The progress reports have kept me informed concerning the particular skills each child was learning or reinforcing. It was much easier for me to plan "follow-up" activities for them to do in the classroom. Also, samples of work sheets were helpful. They provided additional suggestions and ideas for adapting reading activities for the remaining children. The reports were helpful and "time-saving", since there would have been a need to communicate with the reading

teachers in some way (probably by telephone) frequently. In our busy daily activities, communication might have otherwise been neglected.

Progress reports kept me informed and thus, involved in the program. I was better able to relate classroom work.

Progress reports have been excellent.

Greatly.

A general review of the teacher evaluation form comments revealed a number of commonalities:

1. When teachers considered the overall degree of student skill improvement, the determination of value was dependent to a large extent upon the individual youngsters who were serviced by the program. In some cases, teachers were able to report that massive changes seemed to be in evidence; in other instances, teachers felt that virtually no change had taken place. Despite these reported differences there was also an apparent hesitancy on the part of teachers to point out specific pupil changes, gains, lack of progress, or even poor attendance when these characteristics might legitimately be attributed to involvement in the IRIT program. Perhaps here the relationship between the IRIT and the sending school was for some teachers not a particularly obvious one.
2. In a similar fashion, the reporting of attitudinal changes also differed greatly. Some teachers stated that since they had sent their better students to the IRIT, no changes were expected; at the

same time, other teachers reported that students did not enjoy the time which had to be spent in the "clinic". From these kinds of comments a number of questions seemed obvious: what happened in the classroom when youngsters were at the I.R.I.T. during the morning; was that time used for language arts or for subjects like art, and other highly motivated activities; should the fact that reading instruction does take work and concentration should be taken into greater consideration.

3. In general, teachers seem to like their particular IRIT program and often commented that there should be more IRIT's and more youngsters serviced. Thus a majority of the teacher comments were salutatory with virtually none reporting negative aspects of the program.

In terms of the parent evaluation forms, the following typical comments were extracted from those reported by the coordinator; these have been keyed to the items contained in the questionnaire.

1. Did your child enjoy attending the Reading Program?

Much	61
Some	11
Not at all	1

2. What did your child like about the reading school?

Everything, especially the attention she received.

My son enjoyed working in the books that had drawings with the records.

He liked the reading program, because he gets more attention and help from the teacher, because the class is small.

What I like most is when she made book report and listen to stories on record player.

My child likes the machine work in the IRIT program.

Like to read and look at the pictures, enjoy reading with others.

He liked just being able to learn more about reading.

3. What did your child dislike about the reading school?

To this question, 30 blank responses were reported.

4. How had your child's attitude toward reading changed?

She is enjoying reading more now because she has a better understanding of the words.

Yes, very much. He seems very interested in reading. He even attempts to read his sister's books and my sport magazines.

The reading program has increased his vocabulary. He has been able to recognize many new words.

Her reading has improved very much since attending the program.

She now feels that she is capable of reading any material that she sees, enjoys magazines and newspapers.

5. How has the reading program affected your child's attitude toward school in general?

She didn't seem to hold much interest in school until she went to the Center.

I had a lot of trouble with her because she didn't like to attend school but now she has had this program, she hasn't been given me any more trouble.

He likes school more because he can read and keep up with the class.

None, other than now I think she likes reading above everything else.

She reads much better, her reading is more understandable, and she seems more interested in reading.

Child knows that reading properly is the answer to knowledge.

It's improved his reading but his attitude toward school was always good. He likes school very much.

6. Did you visit the Reading Program?

Yes	23
No	65

7. Did you help your child with the weekly newspaper?

Yes	65
No	19

8. How would you suggest that the reading program be improved?

I don't have any questions, only I wish to say that I enjoy having her attend the Center because of her change in attitude toward school. I was a little reluctant at first, but now I am so happy that she did have a chance to attend.

Just keep it going to help other children.

I have no suggestions.

Unfortunately, I was unable to visit the program due to my new job demands but I would like to very much even though my son has finished the program before I could make any suggestions.

I feel that this should be a part of the curriculum of school.

Have more in Hartford.

It is too early to make a comment, but I think it is a very good program for the teachers to start. I do hope the children will take interest in this teaching program.

I think the program is very adequate as is.

I can't say because I don't know too much about it.

I have no ideas seeing I didn't get a chance to visit the program.

I really couldn't say because I only visited once, while Myra was there, and I think the teachers are doing a fine job.

The reading program could be improved by doing more of it and having it much longer.

I would like my child to participate in the Reading Program for the entire school term, instead of a short period of time.

I would suggest that you give my child something to bring home every day to practice reading overnight.

I would suggest a longer period of time.

A longer term or from September to June.

I think they should have it for the full term including summer because it is a very good program.

I would suggest the reading program could be improved if there was more space or larger classrooms. Even without these two suggestions I have made, I still think it is a good program.

The overall pattern of comments which was reported by parents, followed that which had been collected during several previous IRIT evaluations. That is to say, a vast majority of the comments were highly salutatory and well disposed toward the overall conduct of the program. Many of the parents reported that they felt that the program had helped their youngsters, that the youngsters were reading better, and that the children were generally more interested in books as the result of IRIT instruction.

Summary and Conclusions

If one was to examine the overall goal of the IRIT program - to improve children's reading ability so that their achievement level was closer to their potential - it would seem, from parent and consultant,and teacher comments that the goal was a realistic one; children were apparently being helped to read by the program.

When gains were actually measured by the various subtests of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests at the second and third grade levels, and

by the California Reading Tests at ungraded Waverly School, mean gains were in all instances significantly improved over those which had been collected at the beginning of the various cycles. Generally speaking, the gains for the boys and the girls were comparable with neither sex surpassing the other except on the one subscore variable at the Waverly Center.

While a number of differential objectives were submitted for funding it was obvious that these could not be measured in terms of a total program assessment. At the same time, it was also obvious that the stated objectives were being kept very much in mind by the reading consultants and by the team leaders. Hopefully, in the future these objectives, which are particularly amenable to criterion referenced measures, can be evaluated in terms of what the youngsters can or cannot do at a given point of time. When this can happen, then perhaps the evaluation may truly become an instrument for instructional improvement. All in all, and even with these limitations to the evaluation, the IRIT program has once again demonstrated that youngsters in Hartford can increase their abilities to read through enrollment in this particularly innovative program.

-Appendix-

EVALUATION OF SADC AND TITLE I PROGRAMS

FOR FY 1971

(1) Source of Program Funds:
( ) Title I
(X) SADC
( ) Jointly Funded, Title I and SADC

Town Hartford

Project No. 64-1, Component 3

Program Director M. Beatrice Wood

Program Evaluator Robert J. Nearine

Descriptive Title of Program:
Intensive Reading Instructional Teams

(2) Period of Project:
( ) School year project only
(X) Summer project only
( ) School year and summer project

(3) Name(s) of public schools where children received the services of the program: Barnard-Brown, Hooker, Northwest-Jones, Vine Street, Waverly, Wash.

SADC Amount Approved $ 167,160

Title I Amount Approved $

(4) List the number of staff members of the following classification whose total or partial salaries were included in the program budget:

(9) teacher

(3) aide

(1) administrator

( ) special service (counselor, psychological examiner, speech therapist, social worker, or medics

( ) unpaid volunteers

(5) Give an unduplicated count of public school children directly served by this program. 363

(6) Give the unduplicated count of public school children served by grade level.

PreK	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Other
			212	60	46	45								

(7) a. Indicate the average hours per week per child of direct program services. 15

b. Indicate the duration in weeks of project activities for youth. 30

(8) List below the criteria used to select children for services of the program being evaluated (economic criteria and educational criteria)

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF PRIMARY PUPILS FOR I.R.I.T.

1. The pupils selected for the program should be from no more than three second grade classes if possible, in hopes that a better rapport with the teacher can be established.

2. The pupils should be selected from those who are not achieving up to expectancy.

3. Because it is an intensive program, students should be recommended who are able to work cooperatively in this type of situation.

4. Pupils should not be recommended for the program who are now attending E.S.L. or I.I.C. classes.

5. Experience has indicated that preference should be given students who have a good attendance record.

6. Guidelines to be used for selection should include a use of the following:

    a) The Peabody Vocabulary Test

    b) The Goodenough Test Evaluation

    c) Any other standardized test scores available in the permanent record

    d) Principal, reading consultant, and teacher recommendations

7. Although the teachers are requested to recommend for consideration as many children as they feel would benefit from this type of instruction, it is not always possible to accept everyone recommended at one time.

8. Pupils will be selected on the basis of expressed parent co-operation.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF INTERMEDIATE STUDENTS
FOR I.R.I.T.

1. Children will be recommended who are below grade level in reading achievement.

2. Children must be able to work successfully within an intensive program, since the groups are large when considered as remedial reading groups.

   If children are referred who cannot adjust to the situation, it will be necessary to exclude them from the program.

3. No pupil should be recommended who is now attending the ESL, or IIC program.

4. Experience has indicated that preference should be given to students who have a good attendance record.

5. Guidlines to be used for selection of students should include information found in the cumulative folders, teacher evaluations and principal and reading consultant recommendations.

6. Although the teachers are requested to recommend for consideration as many children as they feel would benefit this type of instruction, it must be clearly understood that not all of the recommended children can be accepted in this program at any one time.

9a. If children from eligible Title I attendance areas who attended non public schools met the criteria to receive services, and received services of the town's Title I ESEA program ... indicate the number of such children and the names of the non public schools from which they came.

Not applicable

9b. Describe the specific services non public school children received.

Not applicable

9c. If the Title I services for non public school children were different from the services provided for public school children, indicate the value of such services on a separate page and attach to this report.

10a. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were promoted to the next grade level at the end of school year 1970-71. 359

10b. List the number of children and youth directly served by the project who were not promoted to the next grade level at the end of school year 1970-71. 4

11a. Give the aggregate days of attendance for the school year of children and youth directly served by the project. 14,663

11b. Give the aggregate days of membership for the school year of children and youth directly served by the project. 17,056

12a. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who withdrew from school but were not transfer withdrawals, from July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971. N/A

12b. List the number of grade 7-12 youth served by the project who remained in school from July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971. (Subtract the number of grade 7-12 withdrawals from the total number of grade 7 through 12 public school youth served in the program which is indicated on page 1 of this report.) N/A

13. Report the standardized test results secured for children in the program in Table I on the last page (page 6).

See narrative.

WRITING AND EVALUATION Sept., 1970

CHECKLIST (REVISED)

I. PROJECT TITLE I.R.I.T. - SADC, PROJECT III - COORDINATOR M. BEATRICE WOOD

II. OBJECTIVES - Primary

	CONDITIONS	TASK	STANDARDS	MEASURABLE
1.	The student will	reproduce from memory and recognize the upper and lower case letters at random selection by the teacher	with an accuracy of 90%	Yes
2.	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all consonant letters presented	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
3.	The pupils will be able to	relate the sound to the symbol of all short and long vowels presented	with an accuracy of 70%	Yes
4.	The pupil will be able to	substitute one consonant for another in the initial or final position to form a new word from a known word	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
5.	The I.R.I.T. pupils will be able to	identify rhyming words	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
6.	The I.R.I.T. pupil will	increase his independent reading	by reading one more book each month during the period of instruction	Yes

7.	After I.R.I.T. instruction	will increase his independent reading	by reading one more book each month during the period of instruction	Yes
8.	The pupil will be able to	read orally with fluency	at his level which can be measured by listening and observation	Yes
9.	The pupils will be able	alphabetize words using the first letter in each word	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
10.	The pupils will be able	to demonstrate a working knowledge of the concepts of: a. up-down b. left-right c. in-out d. on-off e. over-under f. front-behind g. top-bottom h. first-last i. middle-between j. beside-next to	by moving in relation to a fixed object as directed by the teacher with an accuracy of 80%	

III. OBJECTIVES: INTERMEDIATE

	CONDITIONS	TASK	STANDARDS	MEASURABLE
1.	The children will	demonstrate the ability to apply the known consonant and vowel sounds to decode words	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes

2.	The I.R.I.T. pupils will show	the ability to divide a word into syllables and apply the vowel principals from a list dictated by the teacher	with an accuracy of 85%	Yes
3.	The pupils will be able to	answer the comprehension questions at their level	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
4.	The I.R.I.T. pupil will show the	ability to use the skills of: a. finding information b. using the table of contents c. interpreting graphs and maps d. locating main idea e. following steps in sequence	on exercises prepared by the teacher with an accuracy of 70%	Yes
5.	The children will	identify blends, diagraphs and other phonetic elements with	an accuracy of 80%	Yes
6.	The pupils will	demonstrate their understanding of suffixes, prefixes, endings and contractions presented during the I.R.I.T. session	through their oral work and with 80% accuracy in their written work	Yes
7.	The pupils will be able to	use guide words to locate information with	an accuracy of 80%	Yes
8.	The pupils will be able to	alphabetize words to the third letter	with an accuracy of 80%	Yes
9.	The I.R.I.T. pupil at this level will	increase his independent reading	by reading one more book during the period of instruction	Yes

CHECKLIST

III. COLLECTING INFORMATION
Primary

Objective to be Measured (Number)	Instrument and/or Method (HOW?)	Information Collected (WHAT?)	Collection Schedule (WHEN?)	Analyses (HOW USED)	Expected Conclusions (WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO SHOW?)
1.	Durrell Test of Letter Knowledge	Knowledge of Letters	At the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in skills
2.	Teacher-Made Test	Knowledge of sound-symbol relationship of consonants	Periodically during each cycle	To adapt instruction to needs	Improvement in blending
3.	Teacher-Made Test	Knowledge of sound-symbol relationship of vowels	Periodically during each cycle	To adapt instruction to needs	Improvement in blending
4.	Teacher-Made Test and Observation	Knowledge of sound substitution	On a regular basis	To adapt instruction to needs	Improvement in skills
5.	Observation and Teacher-Made tests	Ability in auditory discrimination	Regularly and at the end of each cycle	To adapt instruction to needs	Improvement in auditory discrimination
6.	List of books read	The number of books read	Monthly	To promote enjoyment of reading	Increased number of books read
7.	(A duplicate - omit)				
8.	Observation	Fluency of oral reading	Regularly	To detect errors of word analysis	Improved oral reading

CHECKLIST

III. COLLECTING INFORMATION

Objective to be Measured (Number)	Instrument and/or Method (HOW?)	Information Collected (WHAT?)	Collection Schedule (WHEN?)	Analyses (HOW USED)	Expected Conclusions (WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO SHOW?)
9.	Teacher-Made Test	Knowledge of alphabetical order	At the end of the cycle	To improve instruction	Knowedge of alphabetical order
10.	Observation	Knowledge of concepts	At the end of the cycle	To improve the program	Improvement in skills
III. OBJECTIVES: Intermediate					
1.	Teacher-Made Tests	Knowledge of sound-symbol relationships in the decoding of words	Periodically	To adapt instruction to individual needs	Improvement in skills
2.	Teacher-Made Tests	Knowledge of syllabication	Regularly and at the end of a cycle	To adapt instruction	Improvement in skills
3.	Textbook Exercises	Degree of comprehension mastery	Periodically	To improve instruction	Improvement in comprehension
4.	Teacher-Made Tests and Textbook Exercises	Knowledge of study skills	At the end of each cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement in study skills
5.	Teacher-Made Tests	Knowledge of phonetic elements	Periodically	To improve instruction	Ability to identify sounds

CHECKLIST

III. OBJECTIVES: Intermediate

Objective to be Measured (Number)	Instrument and/or Method (HOW?)	Information Collected (WHAT?)	Collection Schedule (WHEN?)	Analyses (HOW USED)	Expected Conclusions (WHAT DO YOU EXPECT TO SHOW?)
6.	Teacher-Made Tests	Knowledge of word analysis skills	Weekly	To adapt instruction	Improvement of skills
7.	Teacher-Made Tests	Knowledge of guide words	At end of the cycle	To improve instruction	Mastery of guide words
8.	Textbook Exercises	Knowledge of alphabetizing	At end of first cycle	To improve instruction	Improvement of skills
9.	List of books read	The number of books read	Monthly and at the end of each cycle	To promote the enjoyment of reading	Increased number of books read

IV. COORDINATING REQUIREMENTS

Who will do What?	When:
Testing - Teachers	At the beginning and end of each cycle, also during the program
Development and/or Selection of Instruments Coordinator, with the advice of Mr. Robert Nearine	At the beginning of the year
Analysis of Data - Mr. Robert Nearine	
Development for Final Report - Mrs. M. Beatrice Wood, Project Coordinator	June
Feeding Back Information to Project Participants	September of following year
Mrs. M. Beatrice Wood	

TOWN Hartford Project No. 64-1, Component 3

TABLE I - Standardized Test Results for Students Participating in Title I and SADC Programs

GROUP PRE-TEST SCORES BY GRADE LEVEL

Group* Designation	Name of Test	Test Subsection	Form	Month and Year Admin.	No. of Children	Gr. Lev.	Mean Raw Score	Mean Grade Equiv. Score	Median %ile Score	NO. OF STUDENTS SCORING ACCORDING TO NAT'L NORM				
										25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
Emanuel	Metropolitan	Word Knowledge	Prim I A	Beginning of 8-10 week cycle	292	2-3	2.0	2.0						
		Word Discrimination			102			1.7						
		Reading			102			1.4						
Garden	Metropolitan	Word Knowledge	Prim I A	Beginning of 8-10 wk cycle	103	2-3		1.7						
		Word Discrimination			103			1.7						
		Reading			102			1.6						

GROUP POST-TEST SCORES BY GRADE LEVEL

Group* Designation	Name of Test	Test Subsection	Form	Month and Year Admin.	No. of Children	Gr. Lev.	Mean Raw Score	Mean Grade Equiv.	Median %ile	NO. OF STUDENTS SCORING ACCORDING TO NAT'L NORM				Significance of gains
										25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
Emanuel	Metropolitan	Word Knowledge	Prim I B	End of 8-10 wk cycle	102	2-3		2.8						.01
		Word Discrimination			102			2.4						.01
		Reading			102			2.5						.01
Garden	Metropolitan	Word Knowledge	Prim I B	End of 8-10 wk cycle		2-3		2.2						.01
		Word Discrimination						2.2						.01
		Reading						2.4						.01

*Any symbol used that identified pre-test results with post-test results for the same group of children.

TOWN Hartford Project No. 64-1, Component 3

TABLE I - Standardized Test Results for Students Participating in Title I and SADC Programs

GROUP PRE-TEST SCORES BY GRADE LEVEL

Group* Designation	Name of Test	Test Subsection	Form	Month and Year Admin.	No. of Children	Gr. Lev.	Mean Raw Score	Mean Grade Equiv. Score	Median %ile Score	NO. OF STUDENTS SCORING ACCORDING TO NAT'L NORM				
										25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
Waverly	California	Vocabulary Comprehension Reading	Elem. A	Begin. of 8-10 week cycle	129 129 129	Ungraded		3.2 2.7 5.8						

GROUP POST-TEST SCORES BY GRADE LEVEL

Group* Designation	Name of Test	Test Subsection	Form	Month and Year Admin.	No. of Children	Gr. Lev.	Mean Raw Score	Mean Grade Equiv. Score	Median %ile Score	NO. OF STUDENTS SCORING ACCORDING TO NAT'L NORM				Significance of Gains
										25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above	
Waverly	California	Vocabulary Comprehension Reading	Elem. A	End of 8-10 week cycle	129 129 129	Ungraded		3.6 3.6 7.2						.01 .01 .01

*Any symbol used that identified pre-test results with post-test results for the same group of children.